

Nobody Can Say We're Not Doing All We Can To Bomb That "Zip" Out of Them

"My most hopeful report came from David Lilienthal who discovered in Vietnam an extraordinary air of confidence among the farmers and villagers. He concluded, 'to have been through 20 years of war and still have this amount of "zip" almost insures their economic development.'"

—From Johnson's speech in Nashville March 15 (abr).

"Last month Air Force, Navy and Marine planes dropped

68,000 tons of bombs on North and South Vietnam targets. This compares with a peak of 80,000 tons in an average month of the most intense action in Europe in World War II, a 29,000 ton monthly peak in the fight against Japan and some 17,000 tons a month in Korea."

—Washington Post, March 17, The figures were released at a "backgrounder" to rebut charges of bomb shortages!

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XV, NO. 12

MARCH 27, 1967



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

They'd Do Anything For The Peasant But Get Off His Back

On the eve of the Guam conference, Vice President Humphrey delivered a speech to the National Farmers Union in Oklahoma. Nothing better attests the phoniness of Johnson's talk at Nashville and Guam about our "pacification" and "revolutionary development" programs in South Vietnam. For Humphrey, an American liberal speaking to the most progressive of the three big farm organizations in this country, devoted a third of his speech to Vietnam without mentioning the issues most vital to its people, 85% of whom are peasants.

Through LBJ's Looking-Glass

The fundamental problem of land reform was not mentioned once. Neither was the problem of the exorbitant rents which absentee landlords continue to exact despite laws more than a decade old which were supposed to limit them to 25% of the rice crop. To speak as Humphrey did of the desire to become "free citizens rather than virtual serfs" without mentioning the conditions which keep them serfs marks a new stage in Humphrey's degeneration. He even had the effrontery to quote Tolstoy's famous remark about regimes which are willing to do anything to lighten the peasant's burden except get off his back. That exactly describes the alliance of landlord and militarist we are imposing by force on South Vietnam, and seek only to hide behind a facade of new elections rigged like last year's to keep out any elements not satisfactory to landlord and general. Our "revolutionary development" program is designed to prevent the development of that revolution in distribution of the land we were supposed to have promised Vietnam's landless at the Manila conference. Like everything else in Johnson's program, it must be read in reverse, as the opposite of what it seems to mean.

It will not escape the sharp-eyed that the final communique at Guam, instead of repeating the Manila promise of land reform, which implies land for the landless, refers vaguely to "reform of land policies and tenure provisions." This implies only some improvement in the conditions of sharecroppers and tenants. This, too, has been talked of for months without results. It is the scaling down even of the promises which is significant. Equally so is the appointment of Robert W. Komer as the President's No. 2 man for Saigon. Komer was for 14 years a CIA man before he became assistant to McGeorge Bundy under Kennedy. Last March he

Those Who Said No to the War

Mr. BROWN (D. Cal): "The circumstances . . . are such that it is impossible, with any reasonable expenditure of men and money, to win a military victory, much less a political victory."

Mr. REUSS (D. Wis): By any measure of benefits and costs, we are devoting too much to militarism and Vietnam.

Mr. FRASER (D. Minn): The U.S. Government is not dealing with the realities of Vietnam but with self-manufactured myths.

Mr. KASTENMEIER (D. Wis): The world has become the 'Alamo'—"after a very penetrating debate."

Mr. RYAN (D. N.Y.): Peace through honorable negotiations has not been pursued with the same determination as prosecution of the war.

—These House members plus 5 other Democrats—Burton and Edwards (Cal), Rosenthal and Dow (NY), Conyers (Mich)—and one Republican Mosher (Ohio) voted against the Vietnam war bill March 16. Brown's amendment barring funds for an invasion of the North came up when other dissenters were not on the floor and only Rosenthal joined him in the 123 to 2 vote. Morse, Gruening and Nelson voted against the appropriation in the Senate March 20.

was named Johnson's \$30,000-a-year assistant for "peaceful reconstruction" in South Vietnam. Six months later he turned in a report on rural progress so spurious in its optimism that even Johnson seemed to be embarrassed by it and denied that "pacification" was going anywhere near so well. The impression Komer has created in Washington and Saigon is of an abrasive opportunist. His razzle-dazzle style of operation accords perfectly with Johnson's own which, ever since he called Diem "the Churchill of Asia" in 1961, has been to lay it on with a shovel. The self-delusion which has marked official reports on Vietnam since our involvement began may now be expected to reach ecstatic heights with Komer in charge. If he's an example of CIA training, the Agency must be run by retired circus press agents.

Next to land reform, the main question is political liberty. Among the urban middle class, this was the chief source of dissatisfaction with the Diem dictatorship. "We do not seek to impose our political beliefs upon South Vietnam," Johnson

(Continued on Page Four)

Russell Vetoes A New Type Vessel to Make Far-Flung Interventions Easier

A Temporary Setback to the Military Technology of the *Pax Americana*

Contrary to that famous Roman maxim, if you want peace, *don't* prepare for war. The larger the military establishment, the more trouble it will get you into. Ideologically the postwar start of the *Pax Americana* was the Truman doctrine. It set forth the concept of unilateral and universal interventionism. But technologically the *Pax Americana* began with Kennedy and McNamara. Until then the U.S.—though none dared attack us—was a muscle-bound nuclear power. It was under Kennedy and McNamara* that we began to develop "options"—from "tactical" nuclear weapons to Green Beret-ed counter-guerrillas. This made Vietnam possible.

Billion Dollar Shipping Bonanza

Thanks to Senator Russell, who makes no secret of his dislike for Vietnam and fears similar interventions, a minor victory has been chalked up against the drift to making the U.S. the world's policeman. To the dismay of Secretary McNamara, Russell and the Senate Armed Services Committee he chairs have turned thumbs down on a \$301.1 million request from the Pentagon to build 7 Fast Deployment Logistics ships, the first installment of 30, to cost a total of more than a billion dollars. These ships, fully loaded, could be kept at strategic spots abroad, ready for swift use.

McNamara still hopes to outflank Russell's opposition through the House, where the Committee on Armed Services is holding separate hearings on these DPL's as they are known. The clearest exposition of DPL potentiality for getting us into trouble may be found in the testimony by the Commandant of the Marine Corps. He said the Navy and the Marines, through their ability to move anywhere over the oceans which make up 71% of the earth's surface, provide "this Nation with an opportunity to exert its influence over most of the land areas of the earth." The deployment of DPL's loaded with equipment too heavy for air transport,

* Actually credit for this goes to Nelson Rockefeller and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund whose earlier blueprint for mobile striking forces to fight "limited" wars the world over was ideally suited to protect the family holdings in Standard Oil and the far-flung interests of the family's Chase Manhattan Bank.

Checking on LBJ's No. 1 Smoosher for Latins

"Ambassador Sol Linowitz, who is the President's adviser on the Alliance for Progress in addition to his OAS duties, said the Alliance has never been stronger than it is today. 'There has never been so much body to the Alliance as there is today,' he said. 'Never as much spirit as there is now.'"

—Washington Post *Society Page* March 17 on Newspaper Women's Club reception for Linowitz.

"It is disheartening to have to acknowledge that after five years of the Alliance the same basic problems exist: food shortages, inadequate housing, insufficient industrial production . . ."

—Sen. Javits in Foreign Affairs released same day.

"Less than half of the Latin American countries have started serious programs of agrarian reform. Drastic changes in the tax system are even scarcer, while the number of democratic regimes, far from increasing, has actually declined . . . the ultimate objective of the Alliance—the formation of just, stable, democratic and dynamic societies—is as distant today as it was five years ago."

—Pres. Frei of Chile in the same Foreign Affairs.

would give us global striking power without foreign bases.

Our Army Chief of Staff Gen. Johnson said that if the Lebanon affair in 1958 had not been resolved by diplomacy, the crisis would have found "our air and sea lift forces inadequate to mount quickly a show of force from the United States." Maybe that's why we fell back on diplomacy instead of plunging into a Middle Eastern war.

At pages 359-60 in the newly released Senate 1968 military authorization hearings, there is testimony from McNamara and Gen. Wheeler on how we could "pre-position" such DPLs in the Far East, the Middle East and the Indian Ocean. "That suggests," Russell commented tartly, "we are going to be drawn into war in new places." On March 21 he told the Senate, "we should not unilaterally assume the function of policing the world . . . if it is easy to go anywhere and do anything, we will always be going somewhere and doing something." This is a project to watch, especially since it is backed by the shipbuilders' lobby.

Don Edwards Questions HUAC's Right to Operate As A Rumor and Blacklist Mill

"The House Administration Committee has a clear responsibility to examine with the utmost care the uses to which the funds here involved are put. At a time when racial tensions are exacerbated, it seems to me most unwise, for example, to give your imprimatur to an investigation of alleged Communist infiltration of civil rights organizations and demonstrations. It is instructive to remember that the House Un-American Activities Committee's files were the source of 30 pages of material put in the Record on July 29, 1961, which purported to prove that the NAACP was subversive and infiltrated with Communists. Among the NAACP leaders whose reputations for loyalty were questioned was A. Philip Randolph, Secretary Robert C. Weaver, Ambassador Ralph Bunche, Solicitor General Thurgood Marshall and Clarence A. Mitchell.

"Extensive raw files have been made available to investigative agencies, members of Congress and their staffs.

The Committee is proud of this activity, for it states:

"In 1966, information checks were made on 4,775 individuals and 3,149 organizations named in those requests. Written reports were compiled on 3,173 subject items."

"Is this a proper function? There is nothing in the authorizing resolution for the Committee granting it the authority to create and maintain a library containing rumor and gossip regarding American citizens."

—Edwards (D. Cal.), head of the ADA, testifying (abr.) March 16 before the subcommittee on accounts of the House Administration Committee against the \$400,000 budget asked by the House Un-Americans. Five other Congressmen, all Democrats, also testified against HUAC: Ronan, Annunzio, Yates and Barrett O'Hara of Chicago and Don Fraser (Minn.). As a result the subcommittee for the first time cut HUAC's request by \$50,000. The full committee and the House were to vote on it as we went to press.

Some Revealing Admissions by the Pentagon Went Unreported**How TV and Press Were Led to Rehash Those Tet Supply Lies**

Just how uncritical, and indifferent to the truth, most of the press, TV-radio and magazines are, was demonstrated again by the results of the briefing the Pentagon held March 17 on the eve of the Guam conference. Thirty-two reconnaissance photos and charts (hitherto shown only privately to equally gullible Congressmen) were released. News stories and TV-casts thereupon rehashed the myth that we had to resume the bombing of the North because the Communists took advantage of the truce for massive resupply to their troops in South Vietnam. "How Reds Cashed In On Bombing Pause" (*US News & World Report*, March 27) was a typical headline.

Nothing Seen Crossing the Parallel

We were not invited to the briefing but were able next day to see the text and the photos at the Pentagon. Few reporters seem to have examined either carefully. The heading itself was a give-away. It said "Briefing by Defense Spokesman on Tet Resupply Activities *Within* North Vietnam." (Our italics.) It did not allege a violation of the truce nor deny that we had stepped up supplies during Tet, too. No claim was made, and no photos showed, that supplies had been observed crossing the 17th parallel. The nearest point of heavy supply activity was at Quang Khe, "about 55 miles north of the demilitarized zone." Trucks were shown moving "toward Mugia Pass" but none actually in the pass, which is supposed to be the entrance to the "Ho Chi Minh" trail in Laos.

Perhaps in response to critical analyses like those in this *Weekly* (Feb. 27 and March 3), the Pentagon briefing for the first time admitted, "some of this activity was believed to be associated with the redistribution of food and other non-military products required by various segments of the economy," and to "military forces stationed in that general area of *North Vietnam*." (our italics). No military supplies were identified in any of the photos and No. 9's caption said of the "containers, baskets, boxes and bags . . . clustered near the shoreline" that "many of the bags and baskets presumably contained food . . . and other non-military products." It added, "It must be emphasized that this was not all bound for South Vietnam." These admissions were not mentioned in any news stories or TV-casts we saw.

Originally the press was told the North moved 35,000 tons "southward" during the truce. Now the Pentagon scaled this

What Time Didn't Tell Its Readers

"Exploiting the Feb. 8-11 bombing pause during the Tet truce, North Vietnam massively stepped up supplies to troops in the South, as shown by these photographs released by the Defense Department . . . An estimated 23,000 tons of enemy supplies were safely shunted southward under the 4-day truce umbrella."

—Time Magazine caption, March 24, pps. 22-23.

"Many of the bags and baskets presumably contained food. Some of this activity seen here was unquestionably associated with the redistribution of this food and other non-military products . . . IT MUST BE EMPHASIZED THAT THIS WAS NOT ALL BOUND FOR SOUTH VIETNAM". (Emphasis added).

—Defense Dept. caption on Photo No. 9.

"In addition to the movement of military supplies, some of this activity was believed to be associated with the redistribution of food and other non-military products required by various segments of the economy, INCLUDING THE MILITARY FORCES STATIONED IN THAT GENERAL AREA OF NORTH VIETNAM." (Emphasis added.)

—Text of Pentagon briefing, Release No. 230-67.

down to 23,000 tons. It appeared from Chart No. 25 that this 23,000 was "estimated" from "a detailed analysis" of "photographic and visual sightings." Just how the estimate was made was not explained.

Chart No. 32 said, "the largest logistic resupply effort ever detected" took place during Tet. This sounded pretty sensational until the figures were examined. Chart No. 25 said 1400 water craft were sighted during the truce "an average of 350 craft per day or 28 times the daily norm." This puts the "daily norm" i.e. under bombing and shelling, at an average of 12½ ships per day. Traffic "normally" must be almost dead if that is all the ships we sight a day along 230 miles of coastline between Haiphong and the DMZ.

A second figure claimed "sightings of 2200 trucks," an average "of 550 per day, or 22 times the daily norm." That makes the "daily norm" only 25 trucks—in a country of 17 million people! This figure gives one some idea of the economic strangulation imposed by our bombing and blockade. The surprise is not that the North took advantage of the truce—as we did in the South—to speed up supplies, but that the volume observed was so small.

Fires Dotted the Countryside As We Burned Their Homes, Their Wagons and Their Rice

"Saigon (AP)—U.S. troops are scouring 100 square miles of swamplands along Cambodia's border in a new operation to deprive the guerrillas of a stronghold threatening Saigon, the U.S. Command reported yesterday. Anything useful to the guerrillas—homes, livestock, gardens, even dogs—is being destroyed.

"After the announcement in Saigon of the scorched earth operation a broadcast dispatch from Hanoi reported the guerrillas accused the United States of carrying out a policy of "burn all, destroy all, kill all" in South Vietnam.

"Col. Marvin Fuller, commander of a brigade in the operation, said anyone living in the operational area is

presumed to be an enemy.

"Fuller said water buffalo, ducks, chickens and pigs were being slaughtered to deny fresh meat to the enemy battalions. Dogs were killed because in a pinch the guerrillas slaughter them for food, he said.

"Associated Press correspondent John T. Wheeler reported from a command post of the operation in the Plain of Reeds that fires dotted the countryside as U.S. infantrymen set the torch to home, farm wagons, and piles of rice straw. Hundreds of tons of rice have been destroyed or removed. Some GIs snatched up ducks for their own meals."

—York, Pa., Gazette & Daily, March 14.

Will Saigon's Press Stay Gagged Through the Next Elections, Too?

(Continued from Page One)

said grandiloquently at Nashville. "Our Republic rests upon a brisk commerce in ideas." *

But the last elections in Vietnam, for the Constituent Assembly, were held reluctantly and only to quiet Buddhist agitation. There was neither freedom of party organization nor of nomination, nor of the press. Two reactionary parties, the Dai Viets and the NQQVD, one an old stooge of the Japanese and the other of the Kuomintang, were the only ones allowed to operate. Ky promised that for seven days before the election there would be freedom of the press—but he never kept that promise. It is a black mark for American journalism that no reporter seems to have raised the question of a free press with either Johnson or Ky during the Guam conference.

When Will Censorship End?

How do you have a free election without a free press? When will the censorship be lifted on the Saigon papers? The most independent English language paper in Saigon, *The Guardian*, was suspended last December after only a few months of publication when its editor dared question the official story of how Tran Van Van, Ky's chief civilian rival for the Presidency, was murdered. Its managing editor, Ton That Thien, was seen, and his cry of anguish "We have become a nation of thieves and beggars" heard, on the vivid CBS documentary about Saigon March 14. His life is believed in danger. His friends are trying to get him an invitation to America. Why does no reporter raise the question of his fate and the future of the press with Ky and Johnson? Nothing could bring the ideals of America into greater dispute among Asian intellectuals than the contrast between our constant talk of defending freedom and our complacent acquiescence in the total absence of a free press.

The chief question raised by the Guam conference is why it was held at all. The first natural reaction is to dismiss it as another publicity stunt were it not for the fact that origi-

* A brisk commerce in standardized ideas—those who have non-conformist views to offer are lucky with precarious stalls on the edges of the market-place.

Irrepressible Questions of Law and Conscience

"Petitioner did not report for induction as ordered, was indicted, convicted, and sentenced to five years . . . His defense was that the 'war' in Vietnam was being conducted in violation of various treaties . . . especially the Treaty of London (1945) . . . which . . . declares that 'waging a war of aggression' is a 'crime against peace' imposing 'individual responsibility'. Article 8 provides: 'The fact that the Defendant acted pursuant to an order of his Government . . . shall not free him of responsibility . . .' Petitioner claimed that the 'war' in Vietnam was a 'war of aggression' . . . and that Art. 8 makes him responsible for participating in it . . . Mr. Justice Jackson, the U.S. prosecutor at Nuremberg, stated: 'If certain acts . . . are crimes, they are crimes whether the U.S. does them or Germany does them, and we are not prepared to lay down a rule . . . against others which we would not be willing to have invoked against us.' . . . There is a considerable body of opinion that our actions in Vietnam constitute . . . an aggressive 'war.' This case presents the questions: (1) whether the Treaty of London is a treaty within the meaning of Art. 6 . . . (2) whether . . . the waging of aggressive 'war' is . . . a justiciable question; (3) whether the Vietnam episode is a 'war' . . . (4) whether petitioner has standing to raise the question; (5) whether, if he has, it may be tendered as a defense . . . or in amelioration of the punishment. These are extremely delicate and sensitive questions. But they should, I think, be answered. Even those who think that the Nuremberg judgments were unconstitutional [as] . . . ex post facto laws would have to take a different view of the Treaty of London that purports to lay down a standard of future conduct for all the signatories. I intimate no opinion on the merits. But I think the petition for certiorari should be granted. We have here a recurring question in present-day Selective Service cases."

—Mr. Justice Douglas dissenting from the Supreme Court's refusal to hear the Mitchell case.

nally there were no plans to include Ky or the other South Vietnamese leaders; that sounded as if something serious were afoot. Or could this merely have been another instance of Johnson's frenzied desire for "action"?

We'll Be Glad to Send A Sample Copy of This Issue To A Friend — Send A Stamped Addressed Envelope

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name

Street

City Zip State 3/27/67

For the enclosed \$5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name

Street

City Zip State

For \$5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*
Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class

postage paid

at

Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August, the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: \$5 in the U.S.; \$6 in Canada; \$10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: \$15 to Europe; 20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED